

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,141	03/31/2004	Peter-Pike Johannes Sloan	MSFT-2901/306874.02	9186
41505 7590 11/30/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			EXAMINER	
CIRA CENTR	10/815,141 03/31/2004 Peter-Pike Johannes Sloan	NGUYEN, PHU K		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2628	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/815,141	SLOAN ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
	·	Phu K. Nguyen	2628		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (B)	DN. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Se	eptember 2007.			
• —	•	action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,3-10,12-19 and 21-32</u> is/are pending	g in the application.			
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray				
	Claim(s) <u>3-9,12-18,21-27 and 29-32</u> is/are allo				
·	Claim(s) <u>1, 10, 19, 28</u> is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.			
,	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.		
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	objected to. See 37 CFR 1 121(d)		
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Offic	ce Action or form PTO-152		
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document		a)-(d) or (f).		
	Certified copies of the priority document.		ation No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior				
	application from the International Bureau				
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ved. Shuilgign		
			PHU K. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 2300		
Attachmen		4) 🔲 Interview Summa	iny (PTO-413)		
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) to of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date		
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Patent Application		

10/815,141 Art Unit: 2628

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 10, 19, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SLOAN et al. (PRT for Realtime Rendering in Dynamic, Low frquency lighting Environments) in view of Baum et al, and DALRYMPLE et al. (5,142,617).

As per claim 1, Sloan teaches the claimed "method for enhancing a Precomputed Radiance Transfer (PRT) mesh comprising a tessellation of triangles, said triangles comprising vertices and edges" (Sloan, page 531, column 1, section 5: Precomputing Radiance Self-Transfer). It is noted that Sloan teaches "subdivision of triangles" in this section but does not teach "dividing at least one triangle in the mesh, but not all triangles in the mesh, into at least two or more triangles apiece." Baum teaches the subdivision of triangles is only applied to certain triangles satisfied some conditions, but not all triangles in the mesh (Baum, page 56, subdivision; under the balancing conditions, only a selected elements are subdivided). Furthermore, Baum teaches "said dividing at least one triangle comprises dividing at least one edge and creating at least one new vertex and at least one new edge running from said vertex for said triangle" in figure 9. Although the cited references do not mention "sample a PRT vector at each vertex," however, it is well known that the triangle is represented by its vertices, and the

10/815,141 Art Unit: 2628

samples are made at the vertices before used in the interpolation to find the values for other points in the triangle (Dalrymple, column 5, lines 15-21; also the subdivision of the triagle in column 6, lines 34-61). It would have been obvious in view of Baum and Dalrymple to configure Sloan's subdivision as claimed because the subdivision of the triangles is only applied to a triangle which is not satisfied the mesh condition, to reduce the processing time in compare with the case of subdivision all the triangles.

As per claim 10, Sloan teaches the claimed "system for enhancing a Precomputed Radiance Transfer (PRT) mesh comprising a tessellation of triangles, said triangles comprising vertices and edges" (Sloan, page 531, column 1, section 5: Precomputing Radiance Self-Transfer). It is noted that Sloan teaches "subdivision of triangles" in this section but does not teach "a subsystem for dividing at least one triangle in the mesh, but not all triangles in the mesh, into at least two or more triangles apiece." Baum teaches the subdivision of triangles is only applied to certain triangles satisfied some conditions, but not all triangles in the mesh (Baum, page 56, subdivision; under the balancing conditions, only a selected elements are subdivided). Furthermore. Baum teaches "said dividing at least one triangle comprises dividing at least one edge and creating at least one new vertex and at least one new edge running from said vertex for said triangle" in figure 9. Although the cited references do not mention "sample a PRT vector at each vertex," however, it is well known that the triangle is represented by its vertices, and the samples are made at the vertices before used in the interpolation to find the values for other points in the triangle (Dalrymple, column 5, lines

10/815,141 Art Unit: 2628

15-21; also the subdivision of the triagle in column 6, lines 34-61). It would have been obvious in view of Baum and Dalrymple to configure Sloan's subdivision as claimed because the subdivision of the triangles is only applied to a triangle which is not satisfied the mesh condition, to reduce the processing time in compare with the case of subdivision all the triangles.

As per claim 19, Sloan teaches the claimed "computer-readable medium" comprising computer-readable instructions for enhancing a Precomputed Radiance Transfer (PRT) mesh comprising a tessellation of triangles, said triangles comprising vertices and edges" (Sloan, page 531, column 1, section 5: Precomputing Radiance Self-Transfer). It is noted that Sloan teaches "subdivision of triangles" in this section but does not teach "instructions for dividing at least one triangle in the mesh, but not all triangles in the mesh, into at least two or more triangles apiece." Baum teaches the subdivision of triangles is only applied to certain triangles satisfied some conditions, but not all triangles in the mesh (Baum, page 56, subdivision; under the balancing conditions, only a selected elements are subdivided). Furthermore, Baum teaches "said dividing at least one triangle comprises dividing at least one edge and creating at least one new vertex and at least one new edge running from said vertex for said triangle" in figure 9. Although the cited references do not mention "sample a PRT vector at each vertex," however, it is well known that the triangle is represented by its vertices, and the samples are made at the vertices before used in the interpolation to find the values for other points in the triangle (Dalrymple, column 5, lines 15-21; also the subdivision of the

10/815,141

Art Unit: 2628

triagle in column 6, lines 34-61). It would have been obvious in view of Baum and Dalrymple to configure Sloan's subdivision as claimed because the subdivision of the triangles is only applied to a triangle which is not satisfied the mesh condition, to reduce the processing time in compare with the case of subdivision all the triangles.

As per claim 28, Sloan teaches the claimed "hardware control device comprising means for enhancing a Precomputed Radiance Transfer (PRT) mesh comprising a tessellation of triangles, said triangles comprising vertices and edges" (Sloan, page 531. column 1, section 5: Precomputing Radiance Self-Transfer). It is noted that Sloan teaches "subdivision of triangles" in this section but does not teach "said computerreadable instructions comprising instructions for dividing at least one triangle in the mesh, but not all triangles in the mesh, into at least two or more triangles apiece by dividing at least one edge and creating at least one new vertex and at least one new edge running from said vertex." Baum teaches the subdivision of triangles is only applied to certain triangles satisfied some conditions, but not all triangles in the mesh (Baum, page 56, subdivision; under the balancing conditions, only a selected elements are subdivided). Furthermore, Baum teaches "said dividing at least one triangle comprises dividing at least one edge and creating at least one new vertex and at least one new edge running from said vertex for said triangle" in figure 9. Although the cited references do not mention "sample a PRT vector at each vertex," however, it is well known that the triangle is represented by its vertices, and the samples are made at the

10/815,141 Art Unit: 2628

vertices before used in the interpolation to find the values for other points in the triangle (Dalrymple, column 5, lines 15-21; also the subdivision of the triagle in column 6, lines 34-61). It would have been obvious in view of Baum and Dalrymple to configure Sloan's subdivision as claimed because the subdivision of the triangles is only applied to a triangle which is not satisfied the mesh condition, to reduce the processing time in compare with the case of subdivision all the triangles.

Claims 3-9, 12-18, 21-27, 29-32 are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10/815,141 Art Unit: 2628

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 7645. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272 7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phu K. Nguyen November 28, 2007 PHU K. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 2300

Sho ligiza